5th March 1955]

Sandalwood oil

* 1128 *Q.*—Sri V. R. NAGARAJAN (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are manufacturing sandal-wood oil; and

(*b*) if so, the quantity produced during 1954 and the cost of its production?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (*a*) No, Sir.

" (*b*) Does not arise."

Sri T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Sir, in view of the fact that there are about a thousand sandalwood trees available in Irikkur firka of Chirakkal, will the Government see that an investigation is made and the plants are utilized properly? "

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" Sir, the Government will examine it."

Sri S. DAIVASIGAMONEY :—" May I know whether there is a proposal for constructing a plant for the extraction of sandal-wood oil? "

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : " Sir, there is no such proposal at present."

Mr. SPEAKER :—" Questions are over."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. SPEAKER.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

Mr. SPEAKER :—" I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated 17th February 1955, from the Governor of Madras :—

' In pursuance of Article 207, Clause (1) read with Article 199, Clause (1), sub-clause (*a*) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby give my recommendation for the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Land Revenue (Sur-charge) Amendment Bill, 1955.' "

III.—THE HON. FINANCE MINISTER'S REPLY TO THE GENERAL DISCUSSION IN THE COUNCIL ON THE BUDGET FOR 1955-56.

* Sri P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir. I want to bring to the notice of this House and particularly to the notice of the Hon. the Minister for Finance a question about which I feel a bit strongly. This morning I found in the newspapers that the Hon. the Minister for Finance had already replied to the debate on the Budget proposals in the Legislative Council. I am raising this issue not as a matter of privilege or even as a point of order but it is a question of propriety that is involved in this. We know that

as far as this Assembly is concerned the Budget is discussed in detail here and secondly it is this Assembly that is supreme though it may be a fact that the Legislative Council has also co-existent power for the purpose of initiating legislation. Apart from this we also know that the Legislative Council itself can be abolished by a vote of this House and it is not the other way about. Therefore, on a question of this nature. I would certainly like and I am sure that every Member of this House also would like that the reply of the Hon. the Minister for Finance is made here first in this House or, at any rate, the programme of the discussion in both the Houses is arranged in such a way that the Members of this House do not find themselves in the position of seeing that the Hon. the Minister for Finance has already made his reply on the very questions that have been raised during the course of the discussion here.

"I am very particular about this question because what happens is we know what exactly the Hon. the Minister for Finance has said in the other House. After one knows what the Hon. Minister has stated in his reply, every hon. Member who participates in the general discussion on the Budget proposals to-day would have a feeling that any amount of what he has got to say is not going to change matters if the Hon. the Finance Minister's mind is already closed. I am not saying that the other Hon. Ministers should not participate in the discussion but the Hon. the Finance Minister stands on a different footing as far as the discussions on the Budget are concerned. It is therefore very necessary and very proper that the Hon. the Finance Minister's reply should be made here first and he brings to bear his fullest judgment on the various points that are made on the floor of this House. Certainly, he may also listen to the points that are made in the other House and ultimately when he makes his reply it should be in such a way that they are more or less simultaneous, that is, one just following the other.

"In this connexion, I would just like to point out one thing. I understand that the same question was raised in 1948. I have not got the details, but I understand that the then Government did give an assurance that they would arrange the programme of the two Houses in such a way that a contingency like the present one would never arise. This is what happened and I would like to bring it to the notice of the Hon. the Minister for Finance so that at least in the future such a thing would not occur."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Sir, I am glad that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has taken notice of this fact at least now. The programmes for the Council and the Assembly were published long ago and they were in the possession of the hon. Members. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had any objection to the conclusion of the debate in the Council at an earlier date on which date I would necessarily have to reply, he should have brought it to my notice and to the notice of the House much earlier."

5th March 1955]

AN HON. MEMBER :—" We have not received the programme of the Legislative Council."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" It has been published and after all the Legislature in our State is a composite Legislature with two Chambers. (Interruption.) It is not so. No question of a money Bill is involved here and it is only a discussion of the Budget proposals. Even when the debate in the Council was nearing its conclusion, if the hon. Members had mentioned this objection, I would certainly have taken notice of it and would have adjusted the programme of the Council accordingly."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Minister has given an assurance. Let us not continue this debate any further."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I shall keep this in mind. There is no question of any point or principle involved in this because the Legislative Council also may raise the same question and say that the Hon. the Finance Minister having given his reply to the debate in the Assembly there will be no use in their discussing the Budget proposals further in the Council. We have to make adjustments to suit both the Houses."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" The Hon. the Minister for Finance said that the programme of the Council was already published and that the Members of this House did not take any objection to the dates of the sitting of the Council as published in the programme. I wish to say in this connection that the Hon. the Minister for Finance made a speech introducing the Budget proposals in this House and that in the case of the other House the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture and Leader of the Council Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam made the Budget speech and, therefore, we thought that the Leader of the Council and not the Hon. the Minister for Finance would reply to the debate in the other House. It was, therefore, not possible for us to take objection to the programme of the other House anticipating the fact that the Hon. the Minister for Finance would reply to the debate and not the Leader of the Council." 9-40 a.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" There is confusion in the mind of the hon. Member. Even if the Leader of the other House replies to the debate, he does so on behalf of the Government. Simply because the reply comes from the mouth of another Minister it does not mean that it is not conclusive. Whether the reply is made by the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture or by the Hon. the Minister for Finance it means the same thing because it is made on behalf of the Government."

IV.—GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 1955-56—*cont.*

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" Mr. Speaker, the general discussion that has been going on for the last five days . . ."

(HON. MEMBERS :—" Let the hon. Member speak in Tamil.")